

*BEST COPY
Available*

July 28, 1966

tions Committees, whose ranking members have exclusive supervision of CIA.

After a heated debate in an extraordinary closed session, the Senate voted 61 to 28 to send the Fulbright resolution to the Senate Armed Services Committee, chairmanned by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, who sharply attacked Fulbright's attempt to "muscle into" responsibilities of the Armed Services Committee. This was tantamount to killing the resolution.

Fulbright's proposal should have been doomed from the start. It could mean the end of the CIA, if the agency were subjected to claws of the militant doves on Fulbright's committee. The resolution should never have been offered.

The CIA has long been one of our most valuable agencies in foreign affairs. Its accomplishments are legion. The Senate properly rebuked Senator Fulbright and gave the CIA a sound vote of confidence.

I shall not take issue, particularly, with the editorial itself. I suppose it is within the limits of irresponsibility which must be allowed on editorial pages. Whether or not the Senator from Arkansas was "crafty" in this respect or in others, I suppose, could be left to the judgment of the editor. The question of whether or not we had any business bringing up this question and the matter of whether or not we are "muscling in" or seeking to take away anything from the Armed Services Committee was discussed fully, I think, and need not be taken up again at this time.

What moves me to take the floor, Mr. President, is a letter printed in the July 27, 1966, issue of the *Globe-Democrat*, sent to the editor by Richard Helms, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The letter reads as follows:

To the Editors:

I want to let you know of my pleasure in reading the editorial "Brickbats for Fulbright" in *The Globe-Democrat* of July 18. It reflects so well your paper's policy of "printing the news impartially, supporting what it believes to be right and opposing what it believes to be wrong without regard to party politics."

RICHARD HELMS,

Director,

Central Intelligence Agency.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

It may well be that Mr. Helms had someone on his staff check all the papers and write an approving letter to anyone who had written an editorial which he thought was favorable to the Central Intelligence Agency. But I suggest that it was entirely out of place for him to have done that, in any case, and particularly to sign his name to a letter regarding an editorial which charges the Senator from Arkansas with being "crafty," and which attempts to tell us what we should take up or should not take up in the Senate, and to explain the meaning of the debate.

In the course of the recent debate on this agency, we were told that the CIA does not involve itself in domestic politics. I suggest that this is a new departure. If we permit the Director of that agency to take this action unchallenged by the Senate, it may well be that in every campaign hereafter, people will turn up with letters from the Central Intelligence Agency saying, "We think Senator So and So is crafty," or "He proposes to try to destroy the CIA, to destroy this great Agency."

The Director would not have to write directly to the candidate. He could do it just by endorsing editorials, so that those who campaign would be faced with their opponents going around with an editorial and saying, "Here is a letter from the Central Intelligence Agency endorsing that editorial."

I suggest that such action by the head of this agency, which depends upon funds from some appropriation—how the money is appropriated is immaterial—is entirely out of order; and we ought to request assurance from the writer of this letter that this policy will be discontinued.

Furthermore, I believe he owes an apology, not just to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas, but to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was surprised to hear for the first time on the floor this afternoon that the Director of the CIA had seen fit to write a letter to a newspaper commenting on an editorial which had to do with the business of the Senate.

The issue, I think, was pretty clear as far as the Senators were concerned, and certainly no one here has ever accused the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as being "crafty." I think he conducted himself in an exceedingly able manner, as did the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I am more than a little surprised that the "silent service" has seen fit to write to the newspaper in question on an editorial which expressed a very personal, and I might add highly inaccurate, opinion about the Senator from Arkansas.

I think this is a matter which must be brought to the attention of Mr. Helms, so that this will not become a habit with him. I would hope that he would take cognizance of what is occurring on the floor this afternoon.

Incidentally, I was under the impression that Mr. Helms was considered to have the potential to develop into one of the best administrators of the CIA in its history. It is my understanding that he has been with the agency from its early years; that he was considered an excellent professional; and on the basis of that reputation I for one was delighted when he was appointed. As I recall, he received the unanimous support of the Senate, and not one word of criticism was raised insofar as his appointment was concerned.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is to be commended for calling this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I hope that all Senators, regardless of party or of their stand on the issue which was debated last week, will bear this in mind.

Incidentally, I wish to point out that today there appears in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* a sanitized version of the proceedings held in the closed-door session of the Senate at the time this matter was discussed. Certainly there were no allegations of the kind contained in the editorial even whispered during the course of that debate, which was conducted on a very high level and with a

mutual understanding of what the Senators were trying to achieve.

May I say further, the question of the CIA being involved in foreign policy is a pertinent one. No one has ever made the allegation, that I am aware of, that the CIA makes foreign policy. It has been alleged, and I think correctly, that the CIA is involved in foreign policy; and by the very nature of its operation, it cannot help but be involved in that particular field of the affairs of the Government of the United States.

But the debate was worthwhile. It helped to clear the air. I had hoped that the matter had been settled as a result of the closed session held by the Senate; but unfortunately, letters like this by the director are bound to keep the matter simmering, and will create even more problems in the years ahead.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. May I just make one comment? I think it is especially significant that during the course of the debate, no administration position was taken opposed to the Senate considering the matter; and no one said, "The President wants this resolution debated." As far as we knew, it was the business of the Senate itself.

But here we find, after the act, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency—who supposedly is an agent of the President; that is what we were told here for close to 3 hours—writing a letter saying, "We approve; we are with you all the way."

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say that the administration, to the best of my knowledge, did not take a position on this matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It left it to the Senate to decide. And it was basically a procedural question, involving a desire on the part of the committee charged with the responsibility for foreign relations and foreign affairs to be represented in an area in which they thought—and I agreed with them—that they should be represented.

This is a most serious matter, and I hope, as I have said before, that all Senators, regardless of their personal feelings or party affiliations, would take cognizance of what has taken place.

Incidentally, the purpose was never to downgrade the CIA, but the purpose was, in effect, to safeguard it, and to maintain its security inasmuch as possible; and that thesis was carried out fully and completely during the course of the debate itself.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

May I just say, as a Senator on the other side of the aisle who took an active interest in this CIA discussion, I have just for the first time read the editorial about which the Senator from Minnesota has spoken.

Let me say that so far as I know, this matter was kept entirely free from personalities. The Senator from Arkansas and I came into this body at the same time. We were friends 22 years ago, and

July 28, 1966

we are friends today. As far as I know, I have never made a personal remark against him, nor he against me.

As far as the Senator from Minnesota is concerned, my first recollection of a friendship with him was in Paris, when we were both members of a commission over there, and he was a Member of the House and I a Member of the Senate. We became friends at the time, and we have remained friends ever since.

The chairman of our committee is not present, I am sorry to say, so perhaps I cannot speak for him, but I am confident that he would agree with me that the whole question is a question of procedure, where we felt, as members of the Armed Services Committee, the chairman and the senior minority member, that this was a matter which should be referred to the Committee on Armed Services; and, by a majority vote of the Senate, it is now so referred.

I do not think there is a single word in the debate, which has now been published, concerning personalities.

It is very proper, certainly when the Senate debates a procedure, for the Senate to debate the matter because the rules of the Senate must be lived up to if the Senate is to proceed in an orderly manner.

I agree with what the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, has said concerning the CIA. I have reiterated many times that the CIA, as a fact-finding body, does provide the facts on which foreign policy is based. That procedure has been maintained, and certainly no personalities are involved in the debate at all.

I certainly hope that any future discussion will be kept entirely free from personalities.

I have not seen the letter of Helms. I have seen it referred to. I do not know how many times he thought carefully about this before he wrote the letter.

I think this is a very questionable thing. If the letter did say something about the personality of the Senator from Arkansas, I disagree entirely with it, because there are no more upright Members of the Senate than the two gentlemen who took the lead in bringing the matter to a head.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and the distinguished majority leader.

I am not only disturbed, but I am also somewhat shocked to learn that the Director of the CIA would write a letter endorsing the offensive and inaccurate statement made in a newspaper editorial.

I think it comes with ill grace. It certainly is an offense in itself to have the letter endorse the words of the editorial.

Still more shocking is the fact that the Director of the CIA—which supposedly is a clandestine organization and works quietly with no publicity and no public appearance—would publish a letter which, in effect, tries to capitalize on an

editorial, an editorial that is so offensive and derogatory.

It appears that the CIA indeed was concerning itself with what was being done in this Chamber relating to the oversight of the activities of that organization.

I think the Director has committed a very grave offense, and I think the matter certainly must be straightened out. He may have limited, because of his action, his usefulness in the position he holds.

I believe, as does the majority leader, that the situation is most grave and must be handled effectively and at once.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, as a member of the Special Committee on the CIA, I have come to know Mr. Helms rather well. He is a very able man, and I think he will be a good Director of the CIA.

I am disappointed and shocked to learn that he would write this kind of letter. The CIA is not supposed to be in the business of publicity, and particularly publicity of this kind.

I happen to be one who believes in much of the foreign policy of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas, and denounce this criticism leveled at him. I still believe that Mr. Helms will develop into one of the best Directors of the CIA that we have had. I am sure he will admit to a serious error.

As far as foreign policy is concerned, I think the National Security Agency and the intelligence that it develops has far more to do with foreign policy than does the intelligence developed by the CIA.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I think we might accept as a partial explanation the fact that this is one of the problems we encounter when we promote career men. It is like the ancient policy of arming the slaves; it always took a little while for them to adjust to their new life.

I hope the experience will be good for the Director of the Agency. This matter of being moved up from a career rank and being given a new weapon may have been too much for him in these early days of his new position. I hope he will become adjusted, and I think he should be given another chance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senator from Minnesota has brought this matter to the attention of the Senate.

I am also pleased that two members of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction and supervision of the CIA are present and have expressed their disapproval of this action on the part of the new Director. I think it is very healthy that they have said what they did.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the existence of this very unfortunate letter from Mr. Helms has just been brought to my attention.

I was very much impressed with Mr. Helms' appointment. I believe that he will be an outstanding Director of this highly important Agency. He is well trained. He is a man with a good mind and has been possessed of devoted purposes over a period of many years.

It is unusual for me to write a man a letter as soon as he is nominated for his position. However, I certainly did that on this occasion. I make these remarks to show what I think of his ability and character.

I believe that Mr. Helms received bad advice indeed and that his letter is based upon that advice rather than upon his own independent judgment. If he is responsible for this letter, I think he should, and that he will, offer Senator FULBRIGHT his deepest apology.

I exceedingly regret the writing of the letter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Mississippi. Three members of the subcommittee have now expressed disapproval.

I assure the Senate that my own feelings are not particularly injured by the editorial. This particular newspaper has been printing similar editorials for a number of years. There is nothing new or different or unique about the editorials. However, concerning the letter from the Director of the CIA, it is the first letter of this kind that I have ever heard of being written by any Director of the CIA. It surprises me that a career man would have so little discretion. A newly appointed man might, for a trial period, engage in this kind of activity.

I wonder if the Director has not construed the so-called vote of confidence as a removal of all restraints and the granting of the power to do as he pleases within the area of domestic activities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have listened to Mr. Helms a great many times. I agree with what the other Senators have said. I do not know why he wrote the letter, but I am confident, from the point of view of the investigatory abilities of the CIA, and its ability to answer difficult questions in different parts of the world, that Helms is a good man.

I hope that this situation will not arise again, and particularly that personalities will not be engaged in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that connection, I hope that the Senator from Massachusetts and his colleagues will ask Mr. Helms if this is the only letter of this character that he has written, or whether he writes to all those who condemn the Senator from Arkansas. It will be very interesting to know whether he has written any other letters of a similar character. This is the only one that has come to our notice.

I must say, in all frankness, that I have heard rumors. One of the things

July 28, 1966

I would have liked to look into, if my committee had been given the opportunity to ask Mr. Helms questions—which we do not have, except under very grave restrictions—was whether or not his agency takes part in domestic affairs—for example, in the elections in our labor unions. I have heard these rumors, and I would like to prove or disprove them. Other rumors have come to my attention which I would like to have clarified.

I have never been willing to mention this in public before, until this demonstration of the Director's very active interest in controversial political matters that arise on the floor of the Senate. This was a controversy of a political nature.

I believe that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] was quite correct in his original purpose in seeking to bring the CIA a little more under surveillance by Congress. This is the only Agency that I know of that is so immune from general supervision and public restraint. It seems to me that this letter is a most unusual action.

There is one other matter that I had not wished to make an issue of, until this matter arose. I believe that 2 weeks ago last Sunday, the former Director of the CIA, Admiral Raborn, in a "Meet the Press" program, apparently had a failure of memory. He was asked about how he had responded to a question that I had asked him. It is in the record. The record is available. It is available to members of the CIA Committee, if they wish, and I invite them to look at it. Admiral Raborn was asked about whether or not the CIA was using the exchange program—I never have mentioned this before, but this has since been publicized. I did not wish to mention it, nor did I wish to mention it on the floor, because I did not wish to raise even a suspicion that the exchange program was used as a cover, and I refrained from doing so.

But now that it has been mentioned on "Meet the Press," there is no reason for me to shy away from it anymore.

I did ask him about it. This was the beginning of my interest in this whole matter, as a matter of fact. This is why I became interested, together with the Senator from Minnesota, in what the CIA is doing. I asked Admiral Raborn that question.

He said that under the regulations—I am paraphrasing it—he was not permitted to answer such a question, and therefore there was no comment. He did not say, "No."

On "Meet the Press," in response to that question, he said, "I answered 'No.'"

I invite all of the members of the CIA Subcommittee to take a look at the formal written record, taken in executive session, and see who was telling the truth. I was astonished when it was brought to my attention that he had answered in this way.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The record will show not only what the Senator has said, but also will show that following his statement that he could not answer—he did not think he had authority to an-

swer—he was asked whether he could have answered if he were asked this question by the oversight committee, and he said he could.

So he did not answer the question. He said he could not answer it to us, but that he could have answered if it had been asked under other circumstances.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the program was "Meet the Press."

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not a great issue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not have brought this subject up. I had dismissed the whole CIA from my mind, until this matter of Mr. Helms' letter.

I must say that I was shocked that a Director should go out of his way to write a letter to an editor of, I would say, a rather radical newspaper. It certainly takes a radical position on foreign policy, and is most unrestrained in its criticism of anyone who disagrees with its position, as it was in this editorial.

This is not new, but I think it requires some very severe action by the only subcommittee in the Senate that has any right or any opportunity to say anything to him.

I am delighted that four members of that subcommittee have here today expressed their views about the matter. I am encouraged that perhaps they may teach the new Director some proper conduct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to see the Senator from Arkansas with a smile. We certainly shall try to find out the information that he seeks in this matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe we should keep our judgment open on Mr. Helms. It may be that a subordinate took it upon himself to write to everyone who had written an editorial favorable to the CIA, and it is possible that someone outside the Agency altogether might have written the letter.

Short of that, I believe the Members of this body who are charged with the responsibility should pursue the matter to see what the practice was in this case and whether there is a policy. If they discover that there is a policy, they might do something to bring it to an end.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I do not believe it is an appropriate policy for the Director of the CIA to comment favorably or unfavorably on any matter such as this.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree. I am trying to make a kind of excuse for him on the ground that he may not have wished to endorse this rather extreme editorial, which is worse than if he had endorsed a moderate one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is most unfortunate, because, to the best of my knowledge, no one came in with higher or better recommendations than did Mr. Helms. I do hope that he will not be harmed by this, and that he will learn

something which will be of benefit to him and to the country.

I agree that he is a man who has good training and great ability, and who can make a contribution; but this is something which, of course, is most unfortunate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I regret very much the letter of the Director of the CIA and the editorial about my friend, the Senator from Arkansas.

I have not always agreed with the Senator from Arkansas, just as I have not always agreed with any other Member of the Senate; because, unfortunately, I find that he, on rare occasions, and other Members of the Senate, on many occasions, have not shared the same sound views that I have entertained on all questions.

However, having served with the Senator from Arkansas in the Senate for 12 years, I have learned to admire him for the qualities of his head and to love him for the qualities of his heart. I have never known him to take a position that he did not take sincerely, and I have always been impressed by the fact that he has an unusual amount of political courage; that if his convictions on a subject happened not to coincide with the popular notions of the moment, he has the courage to stand for his convictions.

I hope that out of this matter will come an appreciation by the Director of the CIA of the great truth that men rarely regret saying too little.

Mr. MONRONEY. I join with my colleagues in expressing the great respect and confidence we all have in the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. We are aware of his interest in preserving the proper civilian balance in this vast field of foreign policy. I concur heartily with all that has been said about his fine record and his distinguished service in our foreign relations activities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: I wish to assure the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in answer to his question of a few moments ago regarding Mr. Helms' writing letters to newspapers, that I talked to Mr. Helms on the telephone.

Mr. Helms assures me that is the only letter he has written, that it was a mistake, and he feels sorry about it. He has given me the authority to say that on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He did write it. A Senator mentioned a moment ago that he did not believe he could have written it. But he did write it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He did sign the letter. I think there were a great many letters he had signed at the same time, but he makes no excuse. He is sorry for the mistake. And there are no other letters written by him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for completing the record.

There was one curious thing about this letter. It endorses the newspaper for its position in stating "what it believes to be right and opposing what it believes to be wrong without regard to party politics."

July 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16681

I hope that Mr. Helms is not under the impression that it is a Democratic newspaper, because the word "Democrat" appears in its title. It is anything but a Democratic newspaper, and it never has been.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I take the Boston and Washington newspapers, but I do not take the St. Louis newspapers.

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, it is with very deep regret that I learn of a letter from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency to a newspaper, in which he is critical of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright].

I have not always agreed with the Senator from Arkansas, but know him as a man of high character, an able and patriotic American, and I am proud to have his friendship, as he has mine.

This is a most unfortunate occurrence and one for which I hope there is some explanation.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.

Mr. SYMINGTON continued: The Central Intelligence Agency has been criticized for its handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis, and for its handling of the Cuban missile crisis.